

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION**

Edward Barfield,
Plaintiff

v.

Case No. 1:15-cv-696

Ron Erdos, et al.,
Defendants

ORDER

This matter is before the Court on the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation filed August 16, 2016 (Doc. 51), concerning plaintiff's fourth motion for leave to amend his complaint. In the Report and Recommendation, the Magistrate Judge recommends that plaintiff's motion should be denied because his proposed amended complaint fails to allege any facts demonstrating how the newly proposed defendants' (i.e., C.O. Parish, C.O. John Doe, Sergeant Bare, and three John Doe nurses) alleged actions in April and May 2016 bear any connection, to the action of the named defendants that allegedly occurred six months earlier. Plaintiff filed an objection (Doc. 53), which fails to meaningfully respond to the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, and fails to demonstrate that the conclusions and recommendation are factually or legally erroneous.

As required by 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b), the Court has conducted a de novo review of the record in this case. Upon such review, the Court finds that plaintiff's objection to the Report and Recommendation is **overruled**. The Report is **adopted** in full. Plaintiff's fourth motion for leave to amend his complaint (Doc. 46) is **denied**. Plaintiff's unrelated claims must be addressed in a separately filed new civil rights complaint, and not by amending the complaint in this action.

This Court certifies that pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3) an appeal of this Order would not be taken in good faith, and therefore **denies** plaintiff leave to appeal

in forma pauperis. See McGore v Wrigglesworth, 114 F.3d 601 (6th Cir. 1997).

SO ORDERED.

Date: November 8, 2016

s/Sandra S. Beckwith
Sandra S. Beckwith, Senior Judge
United States District Court